Thermodynamics of relativistic quantum fields: extracting energy from gravitational waves

David Edward Bruschi[1,2] and Ivette Fuentes[3,4]

[1] *York Centre for Quantum Technologies, Department of Physics, University of York, Heslington, YO10 5DD York, UK*
[2] *Racah Institute of Physics and Quantum Information Science Centre, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Givat Ram, 91904 Jerusalem, Israel*
[3] *Faculty of Physics, University of Vienna, Boltzmanngasse 5, A-1090 Vienna, Austria*
[4] *School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham NG7 2RD, United Kingdom*

We investigate the quantum thermodynamical properties of localised relativistic quantum fields that can be used as quantum thermal machines. We study the efficiency and power of energy transfer between the classical degrees of freedom, such as the energy input due to motion or to an impinging gravitational wave, and the excitations of the confined quantum field. We find that the efficiency of energy transfer depends dramatically on the input initial state of the system. Furthermore, we investigate the ability to extract the energy and to store it in a *battery*. This process is inefficient in optical cavities but is significantly enhanced when employing trapped Bose Einstein Condensates. Finally, we apply our techniques to a setup where an impinging gravitational wave excites the phononic modes of a Bose Einstein Condensate. We find that, in this case, the amount of energy transfer to the phonons increases with time and approaches unity for low temperatures. These results suggest that, in the future, it might be possible to explore ways to exploit relativistic phenomena to harvest energy.

arXiv:1607.01291v2 [quant-ph] 8 Jul 2016

INTRODUCTION

The quest for quantum technologies, such as quantum computers and quantum sensors, is leading technological and scientific revolutions in many areas of physics. This pursuit has stimulated research in many novel scientific directions in the past few decades, such as Quantum Computing [1], quantum cryptography and Quantum Key Distribution (QKD) [2], to name a few. Furthermore, recent breakthroughs in the understanding of the thermodynamics of systems that operate within quantum regimes have opened the door to novel theoretical developments of quantum thermal machines, such as quantum refrigerators [3], whose behaviour can occasionally challenge our understanding of thermodynamics of the classical world [4]. Typical regimes where such technologies are expected to operate are well within the realm of quantum mechanics, which is normally sufficient to describe phenomena that occur in the microscopic world.

In the past decade, it has been shown that relativity can also enter the game. Relativistic regimes typically concern large scales, such as those where satellites operate or cosmological ones. However, the past few years have witnessed a growing body of work aimed at investigating the effects of relativity, such as high velocities and curvature, on localised relativistic quantum fields to be employed for quantum information processing [5]. For example, it was shown that, in general, relativistic motion of cavities that contain quantum fields, such as the electromagnetic field, can be used to generate specific multimode entangled states with the aim of exploiting them for quantum information processing [6, 7]. Furthermore, it was shown that micrometer quantum systems, known as Bose-Einstein Condensates (BECs), can in principle be used to detect gravitational waves emitted in (kHz) frequency domains typical of binary neutron star mergers and pulsars [8]. The results of this body of work lie at the intersection of special and general relativity and quantum theory. In order for these systems to be employed in future technologies, such as generators of resources for quantum computing or detectors for gravitational waves, it is necessary to answer the following fundamental question: *what is the quantum-thermodynamical performance of such relativistic and quantum "machines"?*

In this work we investigate the quantum-thermodynamical performance of ideal localised relativistic quantum thermal machines. We focus our attention on quantum fields confined within cavities that can be affected by motion or gravity, for example in the form of moving boundary conditions [9] or impinging gravitational waves [8]. These systems have been extensively studied recently [5], however, we will employ notions from quantum thermodynamics to understand their performance as thermal machines. We also focus on scenarios where the initial states belong to the class of Gaussian states, which are readily accessible in many quantum optics laboratories. Since the transformations that occur are linear, this allows us to employ powerful mathematical techniques from Continuous Variables [10]. We are able to compute the efficiency of these machines in converting the classical work provided, for example the energy necessary to accelerate a cavity or the energy that a gravitational wave transfers to the field excitations, into quantum excitations of the field that can be experimentally accessed and manipulated. Surprisingly, we find that the efficiency is greatly dependent on the initial state of the field and that two very different scenarios can occur.

For initial thermal and single-mode-squeezed states, the efficiency is completely independent of the magnitude of the changes induced by the classical external source. For initial two-mode-squeezed states, the efficiency depends on the magnitude of these changes. We believe that these results underline, once more, the importance of quantum correlations in quantum setups.

We continue by choosing a well-characterised interaction Hamiltonian and provide a protocol for the extraction of the available energy from a cavity to be stored in a "battery" [4, 11]. We show that energy extraction is not substantial for optical cavities however, a much higher amount of energy can be harvested in cavities containing BECs. We leave it to future work to find more suitable protocols aimed at higher degrees of efficiency in energy storage.

Finally, we specialise to a setup of a trapped BEC which is subject to an impinging gravitational wave. The spacetime within the BEC trap is affected, or "stretched and compressed" [8]. This has an effect on the state of the phononic field, which will in general change [8]. In this context, we compute the efficiency of energy transfer between the wave and the available phononic modes, whose frequencies are in resonance with the drive. We find that this efficiency increases with time and reaches a constant value, close to unity within ultra-cold experimental setups. This result suggests that energy harvesting from classical relativistic degrees of freedom can in principle be feasible.

We conclude by noting that our results are general and can be applied to any scenario where there are multiple inequivalent Killing vectors or Bogoliubov transformations are present in the dynamics of quantum fields. For example, this can also occur in Rindler sapacetime [12], when localised excitations are considered in scenarios such as an expanding universe [13] or the evolution of stars into black holes [14]. Our techniques show that localised quantum fields are promising candidates as the core framework for future relativistic quantum technologies.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section I we introduce the necessary tools for this work. In Section II we compute the performance of the cavities in converting the classical energy into quantum excitations. In Section IV we provide a simple protocol aimed at extracting the energy from the accessible modes of the cavity and storing it in a battery. In section V we provide an application of our techniques to a scenario where a gravitational wave impinges on a BEC confined within a trap. Finally, in Section VI we provide concluding remarks on the current status of the art and open directions.

Throughout this work we employ $(-,+,+,+)$ as signature for the metric. Bold font stands for matrices and occasionally for vectors in 3-dimensions.

I. BACKGROUND

A. Quantum field theory

In this work particles are excitations of an uncharged scalar massless quantum field Φ, which well approximates one polarisation of the electromagnetic field [15] and the phononic field of a BEC. The field $\Phi(t,\boldsymbol{x})$ is, in general, defined on a curved $3+1$ dimensional spacteime with coordinates $(t,\boldsymbol{x})$ and metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. The scalar field Φ satisfies the Klein-Gordon equation $\Box\Phi = 0$, where $\Box := (\sqrt{-g})^{-1}\partial_\mu\sqrt{-g}\partial^\mu$ is the D'Alambertian operator and g is the determinant of the metric. We are interested in localised fields and we choose to confine the field Φ in a cavity of size $\boldsymbol{L} = (L_x, L_y, L_z)$. The spectrum of solutions $\{\phi_{\boldsymbol{n}}\}$ to the Klein-Gordon equation is therefore discrete and $\boldsymbol{n} = (n,m,p)$, where $n,m,p \in \mathbb{N}$. In case the spacetime has an (asymptotic) time-like Killing vector ∂_τ, it is convenient to find an orthonormal complete set of mode solutions $\{\phi_{\boldsymbol{n}}\}$ to the Klein-Gordon equation which satisfy the eigenvalue equation $\partial_\tau\,\phi_n = i\,\omega_{\boldsymbol{n}}\,\phi_{\boldsymbol{n}}$, where $\omega_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ is the eigenvalue, which we will identify with the frequency of the excitations.

The field Φ can be expanded in terms of the mode solutions $\{\phi_{\boldsymbol{n}}\}$ as $\Phi = \sum_{\boldsymbol{n}}[a_{\boldsymbol{n}}\,\phi_{\boldsymbol{n}} + a^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{n}}\,\phi^*_{\boldsymbol{n}}]$, where the creation and annihilation operators $a_{\boldsymbol{n}}, a^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ satisfy the canonical commutation relations $[a_{\boldsymbol{n}}, a^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{n}'}] = \delta_{\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{n}'}$, and all other commutators vanish. The annihilation operators $a_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ define the vacuum state $|0\rangle$ through the condition $a_{\boldsymbol{n}}\,|0\rangle = 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{n}$. In general, one might choose a different set of solutions $\{\tilde{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{n}}\}$ to the Klein-Gordon equation. This can occur, for example, when there are two inequivalent (asymptotic) Killing vectors i.e., ∂_τ and $\partial_{\tau'}$. Therefore, in addition to the eigenvalue equation $\partial_\tau\,\phi_n = i\,\omega_{\boldsymbol{n}}\,\phi_{\boldsymbol{n}}$, one can choose a set of modes $\{\tilde{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{n}}\}$ that satisfies the eigenvalue equation $\partial_{\tau'}\,\tilde{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{n}} = i\,\omega'_{\boldsymbol{n}}\,\tilde{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{n}}$. The field can also be expanded in terms of the second set of solutions $\{\tilde{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{n}}\}$ as $\Phi = \sum_{\boldsymbol{n}}[\tilde{a}_{\boldsymbol{n}}\,\tilde{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{n}} + \tilde{a}^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{n}}\,\tilde{\phi}^*_{\boldsymbol{n}}]$, where the creation and annihilation operators $\tilde{a}^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{n}}, \tilde{a}_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ satisfy the canonical commutation relations $[\tilde{a}_{\boldsymbol{n}}, \tilde{a}^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{n}'}] = \delta_{\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{n}'}$, and all other commutators vanish. The new annihilation operators $\tilde{a}_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ define the vacuum $|\tilde{0}\rangle$ through the condition $\tilde{a}_{\boldsymbol{n}}\,|\tilde{0}\rangle = 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{n}$. Notice that, since the operators $a_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ and $\tilde{a}_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ are in general inequivalent, this implies also that the the vacua $|0\rangle$ and $|\tilde{0}\rangle$ are in general inequivalent i.e., $|0\rangle \neq |\tilde{0}\rangle$. The inequivalence of these operators, which translates into the fact that there is no unique definition of particle in quantum field theory, is at the core of all the great predictions within this area of physics, such as the Unruh effect [16], the Hawking effect [14], the creation of particles due to the expansion of the universe [12] and the dynamical Casimir effect [17].

The two sets of operators $\{a_{\boldsymbol{n}}, a^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{n}}\}$ and $\{\tilde{a}^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{n}}, \tilde{a}_{\boldsymbol{n}}\}$, or equivalently the sets of mode solutions $\{\phi_{\boldsymbol{n}}\}$ and $\{\tilde{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{n}}\}$, are related by linear transformations, the well-known Bo-

goliubov transformations [12], which read

$$\tilde{\mathbb{X}} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha} & \boldsymbol{\beta} \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}^* & \boldsymbol{\alpha}^* \end{pmatrix} \mathbb{X}, \tag{1}$$

where we have conveniently introduced the vectors of operators $\mathbb{X} = (a_{\boldsymbol{1}}, \dots, a_{\boldsymbol{n}}, \dots; a^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{1}}, \dots, a^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{n}}, \dots)^{\mathrm{Tp}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{X}} = (\tilde{a}_{\boldsymbol{1}}, \dots, \tilde{a}_{\boldsymbol{n}}, \dots; \tilde{a}^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{1}}, \dots, \tilde{a}^\dagger_{\boldsymbol{n}}, \dots)^{\mathrm{Tp}}$, and Tp stands for transposition. The matrices $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in the Bogoliubov transformation (1) collect the Bogolibov coefficients $\{\alpha_{\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{m}}\}$ and $\{\beta_{\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{m}}\}$ defined by $\alpha_{\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{m}} := (\phi_{\boldsymbol{n}}, \tilde{\phi}_{\boldsymbol{m}})$ and $\beta_{\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{m}} := (\phi_{\boldsymbol{n}}, \tilde{\phi}^*_{\boldsymbol{m}})$, where $(\cdot,\cdot)$ is the conserved inner product [12]. These matrices satisfy the following identities $\boldsymbol{\alpha}\,\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\dagger - \boldsymbol{\beta}\,\boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger = \mathbb{1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}\,\boldsymbol{\beta}^{Tp} - \boldsymbol{\beta}\,\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{Tp} = 0$, known as Bogoliubov identities [12].

We conclude by noting that, when all coefficients β_{nm} vanish, one has that the different vacua coincide, i.e., $|0\rangle = |\tilde{0}\rangle$ when $\beta_{nm} = 0 \ \forall n, m$.

B. Continuous variables and Covariance Matrix formalism

Among all possible states ρ in the Hilbert space of a bosonic field, we choose to restrict ourselves to the class of Gaussian states, defined as those states with a Gaussian characteristic Wigner distribution [10]. These states are easily produced in the laboratory by employing standard quantum optical technologies and are at the core of many applications of quantum optics and quantum information [18]. One of their main properties is that they preserve their Gaussian character under linear transformations, such as the Bogoliubov transformations (1). Our choice will allow us to employ the powerful tools developed in the field of continuous variables and known as Covariance Matrix formalism [10].

The first step is to realise that an infinite dimensional Gaussian state ρ of a bosonic field can be characterised by a finite amount of degrees of freedom i.e., its first and second moments. We conveniently choose to collect the operators of the field in the vector $\mathbb{X}$ which allows us to write compact expression for the first and second moments of the field. The canonical commutation relations take the form $[\mathbb{X}_n, \mathbb{X}^\dagger_m] = i\,\Omega_{nm}$, where we introduce the symplectic form $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ which, with our choice of ordering of the operators, reads $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \mathrm{diag}(-i, -i, \dots; i, i, \dots)$. The first moments are the elements of the vector of expectation values $\langle\mathbb{X}\rangle$, while the second moments σ_{nm} are defined by $\sigma_{nm} := \langle\{\mathbb{X}_n, \mathbb{X}^\dagger_m\}\rangle - 2\,\langle\mathbb{X}_n\rangle\,\langle\mathbb{X}^\dagger_m\rangle$. Here, $\{\cdot,\cdot\}$ is the anticommutator and expectation values are intended with respect to the state ρ. The second moments can be conveniently collected in the Covariance Matrix $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, which must obey the condition $\boldsymbol{\sigma} + i\,\boldsymbol{\Omega} \geq 0$ in order for the covariance matrix to represent a physical state [10].

The initial state ρ_i of the system evolves into the final state ρ_f through the standard Heisenberg equation $\rho_f = U^\dagger\,\rho_i\,U$, where the unitary operator U encodes the transformation that one is considering. If the transformation is linear (i.e., quadratic in the creation and annihilation operators, or equivalently in the quadrature operators), it is possible to represent the operator U by a symplectic matrix $\boldsymbol{S}$ which preserves the symplectic form $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$, i.e., $\boldsymbol{S}^\dagger\,\boldsymbol{\Omega}\,\boldsymbol{S} = \boldsymbol{\Omega}$ or equivalently $\boldsymbol{S}\,\boldsymbol{\Omega}\,\boldsymbol{S}^\dagger = \boldsymbol{\Omega}$. The Heisenberg equation then reads $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_f = \boldsymbol{S}^\dagger\,\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i\,\boldsymbol{S}$, where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_f$ represent the initial and final state respectively. Linear transformations are well known operations in quantum optics; for example one has beam splitting and single- and two-mode squeezing [19].

Bogoliubov transformations are linear transformations, which implement the effects of spacetime dynamics or moving boundary conditions [12]. An arbitrary Bogoliubov transformation can be represented by a symplectic matrix $\boldsymbol{S}$ as well. It can be easily shown that the symplectic matrix $\boldsymbol{S}$ that represents a Bogoliubov transformation is exactly the matrix that appears in equation (1), in the basis of operators chosen for the vector $\mathbb{X}$. Bogoliubov transformations are therefore represented by symplectic matrices $\boldsymbol{S}$ that preserve the symplectic form. It is easy to see that this property is equivalent to the well known Bogoliubov identities $\boldsymbol{\alpha}\,\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\dagger - \boldsymbol{\beta}\,\boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger = \mathbb{1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}\,\boldsymbol{\beta}^{Tp} - \boldsymbol{\beta}\,\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{Tp} = 0$ listed before, see also [12]. Altogether, this introduction to Covariance Matrix formalism shows why it is convenient to restrict our analysis to Gaussian states.

C. Perturbative approach

It often occurs in physical scenarios that results can be obtained only within suitable perturbative approaches. Among many important applications we have, for example, the dynamical Casmir effect [17], parametric down conversion [20] and gravitational waves [21].

In this work we will find general expressions for the efficiency of cavities as thermodynamical machines in terms of the coefficients of the Bogoliubov transformations, which encode the time evolution of the system and all spacetimes parameters. However it is not possible in general to find an analytical expression of the Bogoliubov coefficients of interest, especially when time dependence is non trivial. Therefore, we will specialise to cavities whose boundaries (i.e., boundary conditions) move in flat spacetime. These scenarios include those that describe the effects of a gravitational wave on the phononic field of a BEC [8]. A well known application of this approximation is the theory behind the laser-interferometer gravitational wave detectors, such as LIGO [21]. The theory of cavities that move with small but arbitrarily changing proper accelerations, or that are subject to transformations which encode a small physical parameter to be estimated, has been developed in the past few years, with applications to superconducting circuits [22] and detection of gravitational waves [8].

In perturbative scenarios, every quantity of interest can be expanded as a function of a small dimensionless

parameter $h \ll 1$, for example

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_{\boldsymbol{nm}} &= \alpha^{(0)}_{\boldsymbol{nm}} + \alpha^{(1)}_{\boldsymbol{nm}}\, h + \alpha^{(2)}_{\boldsymbol{nm}}\, h^2 + \mathcal{O}(h^3)\\ \beta_{\boldsymbol{nm}} &= \beta^{(1)}_{\boldsymbol{nm}}\, h + \beta^{(2)}_{\boldsymbol{nm}}\, h^2 + \mathcal{O}(h^3)\\ \boldsymbol{\sigma} &= \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(0)} + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(1)}\, h + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{(2)}\, h^2 + \mathcal{O}(h^3),\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

and analogously for every other quantity that is a function of the parameter h, such as suitable measures of entanglement [23]. The list of properties satisfied in that case by the Bogoliubov coefficients for specific applications to moving cavities can be found in (A7), see also [23].

In these perturbative cavity scenarios it is possible to show that the frequency $\omega_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ of the modes takes the simple expected expression $\omega_{\boldsymbol{n}} \equiv \omega_{n,m,p} = \sqrt{(\frac{\pi\, n\, c}{L})^2 + (\frac{\pi\, m}{L_y})^2 + (\frac{\pi\, p}{L_z})^2} + \mathcal{O}(h^3)$. Finally, the Heisenberg relation between the initial state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(0)$ and the final state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(h)$ in the covariance matrix formalism will read $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(h) = \boldsymbol{S}^{\dagger}(h)\, \boldsymbol{\sigma}(0)\, \boldsymbol{S}(h)$, where $\boldsymbol{S}(0)$ is a diagonal element with elements that satisfy $|S_{nn}(0)| = 1$. In particular, for the time evolution case one has that $\boldsymbol{S}(0) = \mathrm{diag}(e^{i\,\omega_{\boldsymbol{n}}\, t}, \ldots; e^{-i\,\omega_{\boldsymbol{n}}\, t}, \ldots)$.

II. PERFORMANCE OF RELATIVISTIC QUANTUM MACHINES

Cavity dynamics (or dynamics of boundary conditions) excite, in general, all modes of a quantum field confined within the cavity, a phenomenon which is generally known as dynamical Casimir effect [17]. However, the average change in population greatly depends on the energy that is transferred into the modes and especially in the case where periodic motion generate particle creation "resonances" [23]. Furthermore, it is possible to experimentally access only a (limited) part of the cavity spectrum, for example the lowest two modes. For these reasons, we find it convenient to divide the spectrum of the cavity into two parts: the System S, which is the part of the spectrum that can be experimentally accessed and manipulated, and the Environment E, which includes all of the other modes, whether inaccessible to experimental probes or that leak outside of the cavity faster than any interaction and detection time. Finally, it will be convenient to define the Cavity C as the the set of all modes within the cavity (in this case it will be $k \geq 1$), i.e., the union of S and E.

For the sake of simplicity, in the following we focus on cavities that are effectively 1-dimensional. We notice that the transverse dimensions (y, z) can be reduced to an effective mass M_{eff}, which contributes to the one dimensional frequency in a standard way [6]. We can further assume that the transverse modes are not populated and remain unpopulated due to the high energies necessary to excite them. In this case, one can replace de-facto all indices of the form $\boldsymbol{n} = (n, m, p)$ simply with n, and set $L_x = L$. Therefore, the frequency of a mode is now $\omega_n = \frac{\pi\, n\, c}{L} + \mathcal{O}(h^3)$, see [6].

The average energy E_k of a mode k is $E_k := \hbar\, \omega_k\, N_k$, where $N_k = \frac{\sigma_{kk}-1}{2}$ is the number expectation value of mode k expressed in terms of elements of the covariance matrix. The total energy E contained in the field at any time is simply given by $E = \sum_{k\in C} E_k$. The total energy ΔE_C *absorbed* by the whole field in the cavity after a Bogoliubov transformation is defined as $\Delta E_C := E_f - E_i$, where E_f and E_i are the average energy content of the field before and after the Bogoliubov transformation, respectively. In the covariance matrix formalism, the total absorbed energy ΔE_C takes the expression

$$\Delta E_C = \hbar \sum_{k\in C} \omega_k\, \frac{\sigma_{f,kk} - \sigma_{i,kk}}{2}. \tag{3}$$

Analogously, the change of energy of the system ΔE_S and the environment ΔE_E are readily found by replacing C with S and E and the summation is performed over the modes in the relevant set. Clearly, $\Delta E_C = \Delta E_S + \Delta E_E$ which just expresses the conservation of energy.

We now proceed to compute the relevant changes in entropy. As we have already mentioned, the total change of entropy vanishes because Bogoliubov transformations are unitary transformations on the whole cavity C. However, the change in Von Neumann entropy ΔS_S of the System S can be easily found by employing known expressions [10]. We have

$$\frac{\Delta S_S}{k_B} = \sum_{k\in S} \left[f_+(\nu_k) - f_-(\nu_k)\right], \tag{4}$$

where ν_k are the symplectic eigenvalues of the state (i.e., the eigenvalues of $i\,\boldsymbol{\Omega}\,\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, see [10]) and $f_\pm(x) := \frac{x\pm1}{2}\, \ln(\frac{x\pm1}{2})$.

A. Efficiency

Equipped with all the tools described before we can now investigate the performance of confined localised relativistic quantum fields as thermal machines. We start by defining the relevant figure of merit that allows us to quantify such performance. We introduce the *efficiency* η, defined as the amount of extractible work W per input energy. Explicitly,

$$\eta := \frac{W}{\Delta E_C}, \tag{5}$$

where W is the work done by the system (or, with opposite sign, on the system) and ΔE_C the total change of energy in the cavity. In this context, the total extractible work W is upper-bounded by the change ΔF in free energy F, defined as $F = U - T\, S$, see [24]. Here we have introduced the internal energy U and the entropy S of the system that is being considered. Notice that the temperature T is that of the environment with which the whole system is in contact with. One therefore has the

expression $W = \Delta E_S - T\, k_B\, \Delta S_S$. Combining these definitions, together withe the fact that $\Delta E_C = \Delta E_S + \Delta E_E$, we obtain

$$\eta = 1 - \frac{\Delta E_E}{\Delta E_C} - T\, k_B\, \frac{\Delta S_S}{\Delta E_C}. \tag{6}$$

Applied to our cavity scenario, equation (6) can be written as

$$\eta = 1 - \frac{\sum_{k\in E} k\, \Delta N_k}{\sum_{k\in C} k\, \Delta N_k} - \frac{\xi_L(T)}{2} \frac{\Delta S_S/h^2}{\sum_{k\in C} k\, \Delta N_k}\, h^2, \tag{7}$$

where we have introduced the dimensionless control parameter $\xi_L(T) := \frac{k_B\, T\, L}{\pi\, \hbar\, c}$. In therm of this dimensionless control parameter, the symplectic eigenvalues ν_n read $\nu_n = \coth(\frac{n}{2\,\xi_L(T)})$.

We proceed to apply our perturbative regime (2), which is of interest to the regimes of operation of future technologies, and compute explicitly all terms in (7) to lowest order in the perturbative parameter h.

B. Role of the temperature

It is convenient to investigate the efficiency (7) at low temperatures. Technical limitations to the validity of the low-temperature regime in the perturbative scenario we are considering here have already been discussed in [25]. We anticipate that most of our work, and the results that we will obtain, is in a regime where the temperature appears only in the control parameter $\xi_L(T)$. The temperature should also appear in the symplectic eigenvalues of the state. However, it can be shown that, at low temperatures, the contribution due to temperature to the symplectic eigenvalue behaves as $2\,\exp[-\frac{n}{\xi_L(T)}]$. Therefore, at low temperatures, or $\xi_L(T) \ll 1$, the contribution is exponentially suppressed and can be safely ignored.

Therefore, in this work we assume that temperatures are "low enough", which correspond to regimes which are of relevance for experiments with BECs [26, 27] and superconducting circuits [28]. The cases where we need to consider the effects of temperature explicitly will be clearly explained in detail.

C. Efficiency (at low temperatures)

We start by noting that the change in entropy ΔS_S of the system S, in this perturbative treatment, is given by the sum of the second order contributions $\nu_k^{(2)}$ to the symplectic eigenvalues ν_k. Explicitly, we show in Appendix A that it has the expression

$$\Delta S_S = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k\in S} \nu_k^{(2)}\, h^2. \tag{8}$$

We are in the position to anticipate that there are three different scenarios possible, which we list below:

i) The denominator of (7) and the term $\sum_{k\in E} k\, \Delta N_k$ yield contributions to first order in h. In this case, we find that, at low temperatures, the efficiency (7) has the expression

$$\eta = 1 - \Gamma + \mathcal{O}(h), \tag{9}$$

where Γ is a constant to be determined. For this particular case, we will also be able to compute explicitly the first order correction to Γ.

ii) The denominator of (7) yields contributions to first order in h but the term $\sum_{k\in E} k\, \Delta N_k$ yields contributions to second order in h. In this case, we find that, at low temperatures, the efficiency (7) has the expression

$$\eta = 1 - (\Gamma' + \xi_L(T)\, \Theta')\, h + \mathcal{O}(h^2), \tag{10}$$

where Γ' and Θ' are constants to be determined.

iii) Finally, both the denominator of (7) and the term $\sum_{k\in E} k\, \Delta N_k$ yield contributions to second order in h. In this case, we find that, at low temperatures, the efficiency (7) has the expression

$$\eta = 1 - (\Gamma'' + \xi_L(T)\, \Theta'') + \mathcal{O}(h), \tag{11}$$

where, again, Γ'' and Θ'' are constants to be determined.

We notice, surprisingly, that the three possible scenarios are markedly different. In particular, while scenarios i) and iii) are independent of the perturbative parameter h to lowest order, scenario ii) appears to have the lowest correction at first order in the perturbative parameter h.

In the following section we will proceed to show how can the different scenarios described above arise as a consequence of the choice of the initial (Gaussian) state of the system.

D. Power

We now turn to another interesting quantity which if of great interest in thermodynamical setups, *power*. The power P is defined as the amount energy change E per unit time, i.e.,

$$P := \frac{dE}{dt}. \tag{12}$$

We can therefore introduce the System power P_S defined by $P_S := \frac{dW}{dt}$, which considers only the fraction of energy that can be employed, i.e., work.

The efficiency η in (6) considers variations of energy and entropy over time. We can divide each numerator and denominator in (6) by Δt, which is the time it takes for such changes to occur. Given that the systems of interest, such as cavities containing quantum fields, operate at time scales that are very small, it is convenient

to take the limit for $\Delta t \to 0$ and define the *instantaneous efficiency* $\eta_{inst.}$ as

$$\eta_{inst.} := 1 - \frac{P_{\rm E}}{P_C} - \xi_L(T)\,\frac{\dot{S}_{\rm S}}{P_C}, \tag{13}$$

where we have used the straightforward relation $P_C = P_{\rm S} + P_{\rm E}$ and the dot indicated derivative with respect to time.

The instantaneous efficiency (13) might prove useful in some situations, where analysis and comparison of power is required.

III. EFFICIENCY AND THE ROLE OF THE INITIAL STATE

In the following we specialise to low temperatures scenarios.

A. Efficiency: passive states

Here we analyse the simple yet physically interesting scenario where the initial state of the field is a passive state. A passive state is a diagonal state in the energy eigenbasis with decreasing elements on the diagonal (in the Fock state representation) [29]. The main feature of such states is that it is not possible to extract *any* amount of work W from them [29]. The paramount example is the thermal state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{th}$, which in the Covariance Matrix formalism takes the expression $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{th} = \mathrm{diag}(\nu_1, \nu_2, \ldots; \nu_1, \nu_2, \ldots)$, where $\nu_k = \coth(\frac{\hbar\,\omega_k}{2\,k_B\,T})$ are the symplectic eigenvalues of the state and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{th}$ is equal to its Williamson form $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\oplus}$ i.e., $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{th} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\oplus}$ see [10].

By starting with a passive state, such as the thermal state, we guarantee that any work done by or on the system S is solely determined by the Bogoliubov transformations, and therefore by the motion of the localised system or the spacetime dynamics. This is a consequence of the inability to extract any further work from the initial state itself. In this scenario, we can therefore completely quantify how much energy a relativistic effect transfers into the system S and how much is "wasted" into the environment E.

At low temperatures, it can be shown that the thermal state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{th}$ has the form $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{th} \sim \mathbb{1} + \mathcal{O}(e^{-x})$, where we have already assumed that the contribution e^{-x} due to the temperature is negligible compared to all other contributions, i.e., $x \gg 1$, see also [25]. In Appendix (B) we derive the efficiency for the initial thermal state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{th}$ at low temperatures. This reads

$$\eta = 1 - \frac{\dot{\mathcal{Z}}_E(0)}{\dot{\mathcal{Z}}_C(0)} + \frac{\xi_L(T)}{2}\,\frac{\mathcal{Z}_S(0)}{\dot{\mathcal{Z}}_C(0)}, \tag{14}$$

which is independent of h to lowest order, where we have introduced the function

$$\mathcal{Z}_A(x) := \sum_{\substack{k\in A\\ n\in C}} |\beta^{(1)}_{nk}|^2\, e^{-k\,x},$$

and $A \in \{E, C, S\}$, see Appendix B. Note also that the derivatives are defined with respect to the dimensionless time τ as defined by the rescaling $\tau := \frac{c\,t}{L}$.

The efficiency (14) takes the form anticipated in scenario iii). Corrections to the efficiency (14) come to first order in h.

B. Efficiency: single-mode squeezed states

Let us now turn to a single mode squeezed state. For simplicity, we assume that every mode m of the system S is single-mode squeezed with squeezing parameter r_m. More elaborated cases, such as squeezing only for a subset of the system modes, can be analysed in a similar fashion and we do not expect any qualitative differences. The initial state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i$ now has elements $U_{{\rm i},km} = \cosh(2\,r_k)\,\delta_{km}$ for $k \in S$ and $V_{{\rm i},km} = e^{i\,\theta_k}\sinh(2\,r_k)\,\delta_{km}$ for $k \in S$, while all others vanish. We compute the efficiency in Appendix C and find

$$\eta = 1 - \frac{\dot{\mathcal{Z}}_E(0)}{\dot{\mathcal{Z}}_C(0) + \dot{\mathcal{C}}_S(0)} + \frac{\xi_L(T)}{2}\,\frac{\mathcal{Z}_S(0) + \mathcal{C}_S(0)}{\dot{\mathcal{Z}}_C(0) + \dot{\mathcal{C}}_S(0)}, \tag{15}$$

where the function $\mathcal{C}_S(x)$ is defined in (C3). As expected, $\mathcal{C}_S = 0$ when $r_n = 0$ and we recover the efficiency (B2) for the initial passive state.

Notice that, as in the passive state scenario, the efficiency (15) is independent of the perturbative parameter h.

C. Efficiency: two-mode squeezed states

We finally turn our attention to initial states that are two-mode squeezed. For simplicity of presentation of our techniques, we assume that the system S is composed of two modes only and that these modes are initially in a two mode squeezed state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i(r)$ with squeezing parameter r. Generalisation to multimode squeezing is straighforward and does not yield any conceptual novelty.

In Appendix D we compute the efficiency for this case which reads

$$\begin{aligned}\eta =& 1 + \frac{1}{(k+k')\,\sinh(2\,r)}\,\frac{\dot{\mathcal{Z}}_E(0)}{R_S}\,h \\ &+ \frac{1}{(k+k')\,\sinh(2\,r)}\,\frac{\xi_L(T)}{2}\,\frac{\mathcal{Z}_S(0) + \mathcal{D}_S(0)}{R_S}\,h,\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where the function $\mathcal{D}_S(x)$ is defined in (D5) and $R_S := \Re\left[\alpha^{(0)}_{k'k'}\,\beta^{(1)}_{kk'}\,e^{i\,\theta}\right]$.

Note the dependence of the efficiency (16) on the squeezing. Notice also that these computations are valid

as long as $r \gg h$. If the squeezing is comparable or smaller than the perturbative parameter h, care needs to be taken in how to perform the parameter expansions. In particular, this means that one cannot just take the limit for $r \to 0$ in (16).

IV. CHARGING A QUANTUM BATTERY THROUGH MOTION AND GRAVITY: BOUNDS ON THE EXTRACTIBLE ENERGY

So far we have discussed what percentage of the total input energy in the quantum field confined within the cavity is transferred to modes that can be accessed experimentally. In particular, we have seen that, given a suitable choice of an initial quantum state, we can have a very efficient transfer of energy to the accessible modes of the cavity, e.g. the lowest two. Note that the lowest two modes can be accessed when the density of the BEC is constant to very good approximation. If this is not the case, higher modes must be considered, but this does not affect in any way the results of this work. We are now in the position to move forward and to propose a scheme that extracts this available energy. We need to answer the next fundamental question. How much of the available energy can be effectively *used*?

Extraction of energy can be performed in different ways. In order to extract energy we need to let the modes of the cavity interact with suitable systems via a suitable Hamiltonian. The result is a loss of excitations from the System S and an accumulation of excitations in the storage device, or battery, which we then say it is charged. Employing the charge of this battery is assumed to be possible and efficient. There is no preferential way of extracting energy, a process that must be optimised depending on the scenario. Our choice is most likely not optimal and definitely not final. Given that our aim here is to provide a proof of principle of operation, we leave it to future work to find better ways of extracting the energy.

A. Charging a quantum battery through motion and gravity: a specific protocol

Here we employ an existing scheme to extract the energy and compute its efficiency. This scheme comprises of two cavities R (reservoir) and H (hot), which will act as our active systems, and a harmonic oscillator B, which will act as the battery. The System S in the cavity H will be composed of one mode, labeled by the quantum number n. This is necessary for later discussion of Carnot bounds on performance [30]. If we started with more than one mode in the System S these would, in general, have different temperatures after the cavity H has undergone a Bogoliubov transformation and they would be correlated. This can, in principle, lead to local violations of the Carnot bound and will not allow us to obtain analytical expressions [30]. The protocol that we will employ is illustrated in the box provided.

A protocol to extract energy

Here we briefly illustrate the protocol that we employ to extract energy from a cavity that is affected by motion or gravity. This protocol has been extensively studied in literature [31].

i) Cavities R and H are identical and at the same temperature. Cavity modes are excited.
ii) Motion or gravity affect cavity H, Its field, at the end, is left in a slightly excited state.



iii) The highlighted mode of choice of cavities R, H and battery B (as an example, mode $n = 1$) interacts through the interaction Hamiltonian H_I.



Ideally, we can extract excitations from cavity H and store them in the battery B.

iv) We can compute the total bound of the efficiency and obtain the final result (27).

We now proceed to describe each step of the protocol.

i) *Initialisation*: Cavity R is left at rest as a refer-

ence cavity, or "reservoir" or "cold" system, with the the whole cavity R in a thermal state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{R,i} = \bigoplus_n \nu_n \mathbb{1}_{2\times 2}$, where $\nu_n = \coth(\frac{n}{2\,\xi_L(T)})$. Cavity H, that has the confined field initially in the same thermal state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{H,i} = \bigoplus_n \nu_n \mathbb{1}_{2\times 2}$ with themperature T, is affected by gravity or undergoes some motion. As a consequence, the field confined inside is now excited (the modes are populated) and therefore the single-mode reduced state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{H,n}(h)$ of the n-th mode is, in general, not thermal, i.e., $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{H,n}(h) \neq \nu_n \mathbb{1}_{2\times 2}$.

ii) *Available states after evolution*: The reserviour R remains in the initial thermal state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{R,i}$ however, the final one-mode reduced states $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{H,n}(h)$ of the "hot" cavity are all thermal up to local transformations. This is a direct consequence of the initial state being Gaussian and the Bogoliubov transformation being Gaussian (i.e., linear) transformations [10]. It is easy to show that the final one-mode reduced state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{H,n}(h)$ of mode n has the form

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{H,n}(h) \sim \nu_n \begin{pmatrix} 1+2\,A_n\,h^2 & 2\,B_n\,h^2 \\ 2\,B_n^*\,h^2 & 1+2\,A_n\,h^2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{17}$$

where we have introduced for the sake of convenience

$$\begin{aligned} A_n :=& \frac{1}{2}\sum_{m\in C}(1+\frac{\nu_m}{\nu_n})|\beta^{(1)}_{mn}|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{m\in C}(1-\frac{\nu_m}{\nu_n})|\alpha^{(1)}_{mn}|^2 \\ B_n =& \sum_{m\in C}(\frac{\nu_m}{\nu_n}\alpha^{(1)*}_{mn}\,\beta^{(1)}_{mn}) + \alpha^{(0)*}_{nn}\,\beta^{(2)}_{nn}. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Notice that (17) can be written as

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{H,n}(h) = \nu_n\,\boldsymbol{S}^\dagger_{SMS}(h)\,\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{th,n}\,\boldsymbol{S}_{SMS}(h), \tag{19}$$

where the thermal state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{th,n}$ reads $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{th,n} = (1+2\,A_n\,h^2)\,\mathbb{1}_{2\times 2}$ and the single mode squeezing matrix $\boldsymbol{S}_{SMS}(h)$ reads

$$\boldsymbol{S}_{SMS}(h) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\frac{B_n}{2}\,h^2 \\ -\frac{B_n^*}{2}\,h^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{20}$$

Single mode squeezing is an active transformation. Therefore, $\boldsymbol{S}^\dagger_{SMS}(h) = \boldsymbol{S}_{SMS}(h)$ and we have

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{H,n}(h) = (1+2\,A_n\,h^2)\,\nu_n\,\boldsymbol{S}^2_{SMS}(h). \tag{21}$$

The decomposition (19) shows us that the final single-mode reduced state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{H,n}(h)$ is locally equivalent to the thermal state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{th,n}$ with a slightly modified temperature $T_n = T + \delta T_n\,h^2$, where T is the initial temperature before the squeezing of the cavity and $\delta T_n h^2$ is the small change in local temperature with the expression

$$\frac{\delta T_n}{T} = 2\,\frac{A_n}{n}\,\xi_L(T)\,\sinh\left(\frac{n}{\xi_L(T)}\right). \tag{22}$$

Notice that the single mode squeezing operator $\boldsymbol{S}_{SMS}(h)$ has not changed the average population number of the mode, i.e., the state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{H,n}(h)$ has the same average number of excitations of the thermal state $(1+2\,A_n\,h^2)\,\nu_n\,\mathbb{1}_{2\times 2}$. Furthermore, notice that this formula is correct in our perturbative regime if $\frac{\delta T_n}{T}\,h^2 \ll 1$. Finally, it cannot be applied in a straightforward fashion to $T = 0$. This occurs because the inverse of the first derivative of the function $\coth x$ diverges exponentially for $x \to +\infty$.

We also notice that for $\xi_L(T) \gg 1$ we have $\delta T_n/T \sim 2\,A_n$.

iii) *Work extraction*: The modes of cavity H are now initialised in thermal states. Cavities R and H and the battery B are coupled through an Hamiltonian with interaction term

$$H_I = r^\dagger\,h^\dagger\,b + r\,h\,b^\dagger, \tag{23}$$

where r is the annihilation operator of a chose mode n in cavity R, h is the annihilation operator of mode n' in cavity H and b is the annihilation operator of the battery harmonic oscillator B. We choose modes n in R and n' in H to be accessible by experimental means and to optimise energy influx. This interaction can be engineered in experimental setups and its role in quantum thermodynamical processes has been analysed in detail [4, 11].

The interaction Hamiltonian H_I is not quadratic and therefore we cannot exploit Gaussian state formalism and covariance matrix techniques to obtain analytical results. However, we can provide an upper bound to the performance of this protocol, which can be achieved only in an idealised situation.

iv) *Bounds on performance*: We now proceed and discuss the optimal bound of performance of this cycle. The cycle we described can be easily understood in terms of standard thermodynamics. In particular, given the temperature of the reservoir R and the final higher local temperature in the cavity H, we know that the efficiency $\eta_{cyc.}$ of each cycle is always upper bounded by the Carnot efficiency $1 - \frac{T}{T_n} = \frac{\delta T_n}{T}\,h^2$. We can use the change in local temperature (22) to find an explicit expression for the highest possible efficiency as

$$\eta_{cyc.} = 2\,\frac{A_n}{n}\,\xi_L(T)\,\sinh\left(\frac{n}{\xi_L(T)}\right)\,h^2. \tag{24}$$

The work (or free energy) extractible from mode n per cycle is W_c. We have already computed the total amount of work W that can ideally extracted per cycle in the System S. This is given by the sum of all work contributions W_n per each mode. Notice that when the System S is compsed of only one mode then $W_n \equiv W$. We have already introduced

W_n as $W_n = F(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{th,H}) - F(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{th,R})$, where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{th,R}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{th,H}$ are thermal states of the reservoir R and cavity H respectively. The work per cycle W_c that can be extracted is therefore

$$W_c \leq \eta_{cyc.}\, W_n. \tag{25}$$

We notice that, as done throughout this work, we can express W_n in series of h and we find $W_n = W_n^{(2)}\, h^2 + \mathcal{O}(h^4)$, as already discussed above for initial thermal states. In particular, we find $W_n^{(2)} = 0$ and that we need to compute the next order $W_n^{(4)}\, h^4$. This term, surprisingly, depends only on combinations of second order contributions and does not require genuine fourth order corrections. We have

$$W_n^{(4)} = 2\, A_n^2\, \cosh^2\left(\frac{n}{\xi_L(T)}\right). \tag{26}$$

Putting all together one obtains the final bound on the amount of work W_c that can be extracted per cycle. This reads

$$\frac{W_c}{k_B\, T} \leq 2\, A_n^3\, \frac{\xi_L(T)}{n}\, \sinh\left(\frac{2\, n}{\xi_L(T)}\right)\, \cosh\left(\frac{n}{\xi_L(T)}\right)\, h^6. \tag{27}$$

It is clear that one of the major limiting factors for the practical implementation of this protocol is the total time each cycle takes. In particular, the total time is given by the sum of the individual times of each process: the time it takes to initialise the two cavities and the battery; the time it takes to excite the cavity H; the time it takes to couple the cavities to the battery in order extract the energy.

B. Charging a quantum battery through motion and gravity: experimental implementations

We notice that, although we can compute an explicit upper bound, the amount of extractible energy that can be obtained with this protocol seems much smaller than the available energy. One could be tempted to conclude that the above protocol is only good as an illustrative example of how to apply the results of this work and that it is necessary to investigate better methods for energy extraction, if this energy is to be used for any practical purpose.

We now proceed to analyse the general properties of the upper bound of the amount of storable energy W_c with a cycle-like protocol. The amount of energy W_n that can be extracted by the relativistic degree of freedom labeled by n is always of the order $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$. This means that, regardless of the protocol, in each cycle we can transfer and store (much) less energy W_c than the amount W_n of available energy, i.e., $W_c \ll W_n$. In order to see that this statement is true, we look at the general efficiency in a thermodynamical cycle. The general efficiency η is always bounded by the Carnot efficiency $\eta_{cyc.} = 1 - \frac{T}{T_n} = \mathcal{O}(h^2)$. This perturbative behaviour is, again, a general property of the Carnot efficiency in this kind of protocol and it does not depend on the specific details of the protocol. The extractible energy W_n is, as well, at most of second order, i.e., $W_n = \mathcal{O}(h^2)$, in any protocol that starts from an initial thermal state. The storable energy per cycle W_c is therefore at most of fourth order, i.e., $W_c = \eta_{cyc.}\, W_n = \mathcal{O}(h^4)$.

However daunting the bound above might seem, we now proceed to show that one can still obtain non-negligible energy storage in a general protocol. We start by noting that we cannot analyse the previous cycle for $T = 0$. However, we can look at extremely low temperatures, i.e., $\xi_L(T) \ll 1$. This implies that

$$2\, \cosh(\frac{n}{\xi_L(T)}) \sim 2\, \sinh(\frac{n}{\xi_L(T)}) \sim e^{\frac{n}{\xi_L(T)}} \gg 1. \tag{28}$$

We can look at this regime as long as $\exp[n/\xi_L(T)]\, h^2 \ll 1$. We then note that this regime can still imply $\exp[n/\xi_L(T)]\, h^2 \sim 5 - 10\%$, which in turn would imply that one could overall obtain a bound $\frac{W_c}{k_B\, T} \leq 1 - 10\%$ within the validity of this perturbative regime.

Let us analyse when such a situation can occur. We can focus on phononic cavities in BEC-based technologies. Here we can tune the frequencies ω_n by tuning the length of the BEC or the interaction length. We can choose, for example, $\omega_1 = 200$Hz. The temperatures achievable in a BEC in the laboratory are typically of the order of $T = 10$nK. Altogether, this implies $\xi_L(T) \sim 0.1 \ll 1$. If we choose $\omega_1 = 1$kHz the we would get $\xi_L(T) \sim 0.01 \ll 1$. These numbers lead to $\exp[1/\xi_L(T)] \sim 121.5$ and $\exp[1/\xi_L(T)] \sim 5 \times 10^{21}$ respectively, which are much larger than unity. Notice that the range of frequencies the we are considering is easily obtainable in experimental setups based on BECs. This range needs to be compatible with $h \sim 10^{-3} - 10^{-6}$ for BECs of the size of $L = 10^{-6}$m, phononic speed of sound of $c_s = 10^{-2}$m/s and accelerations of 0.1g or lower. This combination and range of parameters can be obtained with current technology, which shows that BEC-based technologies are promising candidates for relativistic and quantum information processing.

In contrast, optical cavities are typically characterised by frequencies of the order of $\omega_1 = 10^{14}$Hz and a perturbative parameter $h \sim 10^{-19}$, when the cavity length is $L = 1$cm and the acceleration is of the order of 10g. This implies that one can tolerate extremely high temperatures before these approximations break down. However, this also implies that in order for the amount of stored energy to be significant, one needs either extremely large cavity accelerations or extremely large temperatures in the cavity. These regimes are currently out of experimental reach.

We conclude with the following remarks. First, in the scenarios considered above, it could be convenient to also

look at multimode systems for energy extraction, where locally (i.e., in one-mode energy extraction cycles) one can witness violations of the Carnot bound [30]. This might lead to considerably higher amount of energy to be stored in the battery. Second, we notice that the storable energy per cycle is small however, one can conceivably devise an extraction mechanism that can be repeated. This can occur, for example, if a monochromatic gravitational wave impinges on a trapped BEC. In that case, the battery could be charged with very small amounts of energy per cycle, but this procedure could be repeated enough times in order to obtain a measurable amount of energy. We leave it to future work to explore such opportunities.

V. APPLICATIONS: BEC-BASED GRAVITATIONAL WAVE DETECTORS

In this section we propose an application of our techniques, based on a scenario where the pohononic modes of a BEC are affected by an impinging gravitational wave. These computations can be extended to cavities whose boundaries oscillate periodically. In particular, we are interested in, and will focus on, understanding how much energy can be extracted from the gravitational wave, and the amount that can be potentially stored.

A. Impinging gravitational waves

We are now able to proceed and show how our theoretical tools can be applied to a scenario of great interest. Previous work has investigated the details of cavity travel scenarios, where boundaries undergo arbitrary trajectories [32], tailored specifically to different applications, such as quantum information processing [28]. Here, we will focus on the applications for detection of gravitational waves.

A gravitational wave is small a perturbation of the metric predicted by the theory of general relativity and typically emitted by large accelerating masses or very energetic astrophysical events [21]. When impinging on a distant object, like an antenna on the Earth, the wave "stretches and compresses" spacetime, therefore affecting the proper distance between any two points [21]. This fact can be used, for example, in laser-interferometers to measure the change in relative length of the two arms of the detector, induced by an impinging gravitational wave, while they are traveled by laser pulses [21]. There are different such "antennas" that are operative and are planned for the future, such as aLIGO and aVIRGO [33]. The main difficulties lie in the low strength of signal, compared to the background noise, in the expected frequency domains and the randomness of the events.

Recently, a scheme was proposed to detect gravitational waves with micrometer quantum systems, known as BECs [8]. It was shown that a trapped BEC with small phononic excitations can be effectively modelled as a massless bosonic field Φ which moves slower than light (at the speed of sound $c_s \ll c$) and is trapped in a cavity [34]. A gravitational wave that passes through the system affects the phononic modes of the cavity [8]. This phenomenon induces detectable changes in the quantum state of the phonons that can be used as a signature of the metric perturbation with current technology [8]. This process requires energy to be transferred from the gravitational perturbation to the quantum field. Here we will analyse the performance of this process.

B. Modeling gravitational waves

The model of a field contained in a cavity that we have presented in this work applies in a straightforward fashion to this new setup, except that the speed of light c is replaced with the speed of sound c_s, see [8]. We also assume that the BEC is strongly confined in two dimensions and is therefore effectively 1-dimensional. There is ongoing work that aims at extending this idealisation to a realistic 3-dimensional cavity setup. Finally, we can model the effect of a sinusoidal impinging gravitational wave as a time dependent cavity length $L(t) = L(1 + \epsilon \sin(\Omega\,\tau))$ for time τ, where $\epsilon \ll 1$ is the amplitude of the wave when it reaches the Earth [8, 21]. Note that we have replaced the perturbative parameter h with ϵ in this application for the sake of consistency with previous work.

Altogether, this information can be used to show that the relevant Bogoliubov coefficient between two on resonance modes k, k' (i.e., that satisfy $\omega_k + \omega_{k'} = \Omega$) of the initial and final field read

$$\beta_{kk'} = \frac{\pi\,\epsilon}{4}\sqrt{kk'}\,\tau, \tag{29}$$

while $\alpha^{(0)}_{k'k'} = 1$, the dimensionless time is $\tau = \frac{c\,t}{L}$ and the phase vanishes, i.e., $\theta = 0$. For a derivation of (29) and its domain of validity see [8]. However, the expression in [8] is incorrect and needs to be updated. Notice that, after a sufficiently long time, the coefficient (29) is the only one that contributes effectively to the population of the cavity modes.

C. Energy transfer from gravitational waves: initial passive state

We now choose as the initial state a thermal state with temperature T. The gravitational wave has a frequency Ω that we assume is resonant with only two modes of the cavity ω_k and $\omega_{k'}$, i.e., $\Omega = \omega_k + \omega_{k'}$ (or $\kappa = k + k'$). After a sufficiently long time τ, the only "large enough" term is $|\beta_{kk'}|^2 = |\beta_{k'k}|^2 \propto \tau^2$. This appears in the last numerator and denominator of the efficiency (14). We therefore have a simple expression for the efficiency for this case, which reads

$$\eta = 1 - \frac{\xi_L(T)}{\kappa}. \tag{30}$$

A typical BEC configurations is $T = 10\text{nK}$ and $L = 1\text{mm}$. Assuming $\kappa = 3$ as the sum of two lowest modes, we find that $\xi_L(T)/\kappa \sim 10^{-6} - 10^{-7} \ll 1$. This means that the efficiency approaches unity for initial thermal states. Notice that, as discussed above, this result is not valid for all times but for times τ that do not break the validity of the perturbative approach.

D. Energy transfer from gravitational waves: initial single mode squeezed state

We would like to study the efficiency for initial single mode squeezed states. We assume that the the System S is composed of modes k and k', which are in resonance with the gravitational wave (i.e., $\kappa = k+k'$). Both modes are initially in a single mode squeezed state with squeezing r. We can then employ (15) to compute the efficiency of the conversion of gravitational energy into mode excitations. We note that, after a sufficiently long time τ, the terms that effectively contribute in (15) have the following expressions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_S \sim& 4\,|\beta_{kk'}|^2\,\sinh^2 r \\ \dot{\mathcal{C}}_S \sim& -2\,\kappa\,|\beta_{kk'}|^2\,\sinh^2 r \\ \mathcal{Z}_E \sim \mathcal{Z}_S \sim& 2\,|\beta_{kk'}|^2 \\ \dot{\mathcal{Z}}_E \sim \dot{\mathcal{Z}}_S \sim& -\kappa\,|\beta_{kk'}|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

We are finally able to find

$$\eta = 1 - \frac{\xi_L(T)}{\kappa}. \tag{32}$$

We notice that in (32) we ignore contributions of the order $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\tau})$ after a suitably long time. In addition, this "sufficiently long" time has to be compatible also with the perturbative expansion regime.

We also notice that we had to take care of the terms $\beta^{(2)}_{kk'}$ and $\beta^{(2)}_{k'k}$. It can be shown, using techniques developed for these cavities [32], that these terms do not increase as fast as τ^2. The proof of this statement is a straightforward application of these previous results [32] and we omit it here.

Finally, and interestingly, we see that the expression (32) is the same as the one for the initial passive states and is independent of the squeezing. This occurs as long as $\sinh^2 r\, h^2 \ll 1$, after which we need to treat the perturbative expansion differently, as expected.

E. Energy transfer and power spectrum

We have computed the efficiency (32) for the case of a sinusoidal gravitational wave impinging on a (one-dimensional) BEC gravitational wave detector. It is evident from (32) that with the increase of time, the efficiency increases and approaches a finite limit value. This can be easily explained by the fact that the majority of the energy delivered by the gravitational wave is transferred to, and absorbed by, the resonant modes. The efficiency (32) for this scenarios is a result of a series of approximations and does not apply for all times but as long as $\tau\,\epsilon \ll 1$.

We note that (32) is a special case of C2. Careful analysis of (C2) indicates that the behaviour of the efficiency would dramatically change if, for example, the two resonant modes were one in the system S and one in the environment E, i.e., a scenario where the control over the system S is not very good and part of the energy will "leak" to the environment E.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work we have introduced techniques to understand the performance of localised relativistic quantum fields, such as quantum fields confined in moving cavities or the phononic modes of a trapped BEC, as "extractors" of energy from relativistic degrees of freedom. Each localised setup is divided into a system, which can be experimentally accessed, manipulated and controlled, and an environment, which acts as a reservoir. We have obtained analytical expressions for the efficiency of transfer of energy into the system (i.e., field excitations) from the classical change of the boundaries of the cavity, which can be induced by motion, or from a classical gravitational wave. The latter scenario is of great relevance for modern applications within gravitational wave science, astrophysics and cosmology. In this context we have shown that sinusoidal modulations, which can be induced by impinging gravitational waves, are associated to an efficiency that grows with the duration of the signal itself and approaches unity in realistic ultra-cold setups. These exciting results suggests that it can be of fundamental and technological relevance to develop technologies tailored at extracting energy from relativistic degrees of freedom and the gravitational field. In particular, our work aids the analysis of feasibility of recently proposed technologies for the detection of gravitational wave by BEC-based antennas. Extension of this work to more realistic cavities, with 3 spatial dimensions and shapes optimised and tailored for detection of signal from binary neutron star mergers and pulsars, is left to future work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the late Jacob Bekenstein, Tsvi Piran and Jandu Dradouma for useful comments and suggestions. We are greatly indebted to Marcus Huber for his help with the thermodynamics aspects of this work. D.E.B. was initially supported by the I-CORE Program of the Planning and Budgeting Committee and the Israel Science Foundation (grant No. 1937/12), as well as by the Israel Science Foundation personal grant No. 24/12.

D.E.B. was also supported by John Templeton Foundation grant no. 58745 and the COST Actions MP1209 and MP1304. D.E.B. acknowledges support from the LIQUID collaboration, in which context part of this work was done. D. E. B. also acknowledges later hospitality from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, where part of this work was done.

Appendix A: Expressions for thermodynamical quantities in the perturbative regime

We start by the general expression of a covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{U} & \boldsymbol{V} \\ \boldsymbol{V}^* & \boldsymbol{U}^* \end{pmatrix}, \tag{A1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{U} = \boldsymbol{U}^\dagger$ and $\boldsymbol{V} = \boldsymbol{V}^{Tp}$. The final state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_f = \boldsymbol{S}^\dagger \, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\mathrm{i} \, \boldsymbol{S}$ after a Bogoliubov transformation reads

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}_\mathrm{f} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{f} & \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{f} \\ \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{f}^* & \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{f}^* \end{pmatrix}, \tag{A2}$$

where, the final matrices $\boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{f}$ and $\boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{f}$ have the expression

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{f} &= \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\dagger \, \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{i} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\dagger \, \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{i} \, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \boldsymbol{\beta}^{Tp} \, \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{i}^* \, \boldsymbol{\alpha} + \boldsymbol{\beta}^{Tp} \, \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{i}^* \, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \\ \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{f} &= \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\dagger \, \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{i} \, \boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\dagger \, \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{i} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^* + \boldsymbol{\beta}^{Tp} \, \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{i}^* \, \boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\beta}^{Tp} \, \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{i}^* \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^* \end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

and the matrices $\boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{i}, \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{i}$ correspond to the decomposition initial state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_\mathrm{i}$ (see (A1)). Employing our peturbative techniques we find

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\mathrm{f} = &\begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)*} \, \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{i} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)} & \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)*} \, \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{i} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)*} \\ \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)T} \, \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{i}^* \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)} & \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)} \, \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{i}^* \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)*} \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{f}^{(1)} & \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{f}^{(1)} \\ \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{f}^{(1)*} & \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{f}^{(1)*} \end{pmatrix} h + \mathcal{O}(h^2), \end{aligned} \tag{A4}$$

where we have introduced the first order contributions to $\boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{f}$ and $\boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{f}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{f}^{(1)} =& \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(1)\dagger} \, \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{i} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)*} \, \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{i} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(1)} \\ &+ \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)*} \, \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{i} \, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)*} + \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)Tp} \, \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{i}^* \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)} \\ \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{f}^{(1)} =& \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(1)\dagger} \, \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{i} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)*} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)*} \, \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{i} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(1)*} \\ &+ \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)*} \, \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{i} \, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)} + \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)Tp} \, \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{i}^* \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)*} \end{aligned} \tag{A5}$$

for simplicity of presentation of the formula above and we note that $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)}$ is always diagonal and satisfies $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)*} = \mathbb{1}$. We anticipate that the second order contribution $\boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{f}^{(2)}$ to the matrix $\boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{f}$ is the only relevant second order contribution to this work, and reads

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{f}^{(2)} =& \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)\dagger} \, \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{i} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(2)} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(1)\dagger} \, \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{i} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(1)} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(2)\dagger} \, \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{i} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)} \\ &+ \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)Tp} \, \boldsymbol{U}_\mathrm{i}^* \, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)*} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(1)\dagger} \, \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{i} \, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)*} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)*} \, \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{i} \, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)*} \\ &+ \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)Tp} \, \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{i}^* \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(1)} + \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)Tp} \, \boldsymbol{V}_\mathrm{i}^* \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)}. \end{aligned} \tag{A6}$$

We add to our toolbox the perturbative contributions to the Bogoliubov identities $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\dagger - \boldsymbol{\beta} \, \boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger = \mathbb{1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{Tp} - \boldsymbol{\beta} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{Tp} = 0$ since this will be useful later. These read

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)*} &= \mathbb{1} \\ \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(1)\dagger} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(1)} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)*} &= 0 \\ \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(2)\dagger} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(2)} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)*} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(1)} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(1)\dagger} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)} \, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)\dagger} &= 0 \\ \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)} \, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)Tp} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)} &= 0 \\ \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(1)} \, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)Tp} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)} \, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)Tp} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(1)Tp} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(0)} &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{A7}$$

Notice that the Bogoliubov coefficients satisfy the pair of identities written above or, equivalently, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\dagger \, \boldsymbol{\alpha} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^{Tp} \, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* = \mathbb{1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^\dagger \, \boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^{Tp} \, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^* = 0$. This last pair of identities has its own perturbative expansion analogous to (A7), which we omit here.

Finally, we compute the lowest order contribution to the change of entropy ΔS_S of the systems S. We start by the definition of entropy (4)

$$\Delta S_S = \sum_{k \in S} \left[\frac{\nu_k + 1}{2} \, \ln(\frac{\nu_k + 1}{2}) - \frac{\nu_k - 1}{2} \, \ln(\frac{\nu_k - 1}{2}) \right] \tag{A8}$$

where ν_k are the symplectic eigenvalues of the state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. It is known that, in a perturbative regime, the symplectic eigenvalues have the expression $\nu_k = 1 + \nu_k^{(2)} \, h^2 + \mathcal{O}(h^3)$ and $\nu_k^{(2)} \geq 0$, see [35]. Therefore we have, to lowest order $\Delta S_S = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in S} \nu_k^{(2)} \, h^2$. To illustrate the power of these techniques, we combine all the elements of this section to provide the final expression for the efficiency η in the perturbative regime when all changes in (7), except for the change in entropy, occur to first order in h. We find

$$\eta = 1 - \frac{\sum_{\substack{k \in E \\ m \in C}} k \, \Re \left[\alpha_{km}^{(1)*} \, \alpha_{kk}^{(0)} \, U_{i,mk} + \alpha_{kk}^{(0)*} \, \beta_{mk}^{(1)*} \, V_{i,km} \right]}{\sum_{k,m \in C} k \, \Re \left[\alpha_{km}^{(1)*} \, \alpha_{kk}^{(0)} \, U_{i,mk} + \alpha_{kk}^{(0)*} \, \beta_{mk}^{(1)*} \, V_{i,km} \right]} - \frac{\xi_L(T)}{2} \frac{\sum_{k \in S} \nu_k^{(2)}}{\sum_{k,m \in C} k \, \Re \left[\alpha_{km}^{(1)*} \, \alpha_{kk}^{(0)} \, U_{i,mk} + \alpha_{kk}^{(0)*} \, \beta_{mk}^{(1)*} \, V_{i,km} \right]} h. \tag{A9}$$

Notice that one could add to (A9) all the second order contributions. This would produce a complicated formula which would not yield any practical or illustrative purposes. For this reason, we omit it here and compute second order contributions only when necessary.

Appendix B: Initial passive states

We specialise here to the energy efficiency η in (7) for initial passive states. We have already seen that passive states at low temperatures have the expression $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{th} \sim \mathbb{1}$, or equivalently $\boldsymbol{U}_i = \mathbb{1}$ and $\boldsymbol{V}_i = 0$. This implies that $\boldsymbol{U}_{\rm f} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\dagger\,\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \boldsymbol{\beta}^{Tp}\,\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{V}_{\rm f} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\dagger\,\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\beta}^{Tp}\,\boldsymbol{\alpha}^*$. We notice that the elements of the final state that contribute to the efficiency (7) are the diagonal elements, which cannot have first order contributions, see [35]. For this reason, we cannot employ (A9) directly, since both numerator and denominator of the first term vanish. We are only interested in second order diagonal contributions to $U^{(2)}_{{\rm f},kk}$ to $\boldsymbol{U}_f$, which can be found by employing (A6) and (A7). We obtain

$$U^{(2)}_{{\rm f},kk} = 2\sum_{n\in C} |\beta^{(1)}_{kn}|^2. \tag{B1}$$

Finally, the efficiency η for this scenario reads

$$\eta = 1 - \frac{\dot{\mathcal{Z}}_E(0)}{\dot{\mathcal{Z}}_C(0)} + \frac{\xi_L(T)}{2}\frac{\mathcal{Z}_S(0)}{\dot{\mathcal{Z}}_C(0)}, \tag{B2}$$

which is independent of h to lowest order, where we have introduced the function

$$\mathcal{Z}_A(x) := \sum_{\substack{k\in A\\ n\in C}} |\beta^{(1)}_{nk}|^2\, e^{-k\,x}, \tag{B3}$$

and $A \in \{E, C, S\}$.

Appendix C: Initial single-mode squeezed states

We now shift our attention to initial states with squeezing. We start by assuming that squeezing, whether of a single mode in this section or between two modes in the next one, will always be present between modes of the System S. This assumption can be relaxed and different scenarios can be considered. However, considering all possible configurations is not our aim here and we leave it to future work.

Here we assume, for simplicity, that all modes of the System S are single mode squeezed, with squeezing parameters s_k that label the respective mode $k \in S$ which is squeezed. We also assume that all modes of the Environment E are initially in the vacuum (or, as discussed before, in a thermal state where the effects of temperature are negligible). It is possible to extend these calculations to a scenario where not all of the modes in the System S are single mode squeezed. This does not lead to conceptual novelty and we leave it for future work.

In the present case, the initial state $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ has the following elements:

$$\begin{aligned} U_{{\rm i},nm} &= \cosh(2\,r_k)\,\delta_{nm} && \text{for } n,m \in S\\ U_{{\rm i},nm} &= \delta_{nm} && \text{for } m \in E\\ V_{{\rm i},nm} &= e^{i\,\theta_k}\sinh(2\,r_k)\,\delta_{nm} && \text{for } n \in S, \end{aligned} \tag{C1}$$

while all other elements vanish.

If we try to employ the elements (C1) in the expression (A9) we notice that first order Bogoliubov coefficients contribute with diagonal elements $\alpha^{(1)}_{kk}$ and $\beta^{(1)}_{kk}$, which we know vanish in general. This can be seen from the second line in (A7). This equation implies $\Re[\exp(i\,\omega_k\,t)\,\alpha^{(1)*}_{kk}] = 0$ and this has to be true for all times t. The only solution is that $\alpha_{kk} \equiv 0$. This, in turn, tells us that we cannot employ (C1) directly.

As done in Appendix B, we need to compute the second order contributions to all terms in (7). After some algebra we find:

$$\eta = 1 - \frac{\dot{\mathcal{Z}}_E(0)}{\dot{\mathcal{Z}}_C(0) + \dot{\mathcal{C}}_S(0)} + \frac{\xi_L(T)}{2}\frac{\mathcal{Z}_S(0) + \mathcal{C}_S(0)}{\dot{\mathcal{Z}}_C(0) + \dot{\mathcal{C}}_S(0)}, \tag{C2}$$

where we have introduced

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_S(x) := \sum_{\substack{m\in S\\ k\in C}} \Big[&\Re\left(\alpha^{(0)}_{km}\,\beta^{(2)}_{mk}\,e^{-i\,\theta_m}\right)\,\delta_{km}\\ &+ \Re\left(\alpha^{(1)}_{mk}\,\beta^{(1)}_{mk}\,e^{-i\,\theta_m}\right)\\ &|\beta^{(1)}_{mk}|^2\,\tanh r_m\Big]\,\sinh(2\,r_m)\,e^{-k\,x} \end{aligned} \tag{C3}$$

Notice that, as expected, when $r_n = 0$ then $\mathcal{C}_S = 0$ and one recovers the efficiency (B2) for the initial passive state.

Appendix D: Initial two-mode squeezed states

Finally, we turn our attention to computing the efficiency for a system S of two modes k, k' which are initially two-mode squeezed with squeezing r. We need to assume that the squeezing r is finite and large enough, i.e., $\sinh r \gg h$. If this does not hold, a different analysis needs to be performed, in the same spirit of [25]. The initial state has elements

$$\begin{aligned} U_{{\rm i},nm} &= \cosh(2\,r)\,\delta_{nm} && \text{for } n,m \in S\\ U_{{\rm i},nm} &= \delta_{nm} && \text{for } m \in E\\ V_{{\rm i},nm} &= e^{i\,\theta}\sinh(2\,r) && \text{for } n \neq m \in S, \end{aligned} \tag{D1}$$

and vanishing elements otherwise. Notice that the matrix $\boldsymbol{V}$ is antidiagonal in the system S degrees of freedom.

We now consider the expression (A9) for the efficiency. The numerator

$\sum_{\substack{k\in E\\ m\in C}} k\,\Re\left[\alpha^{(1)*}_{km}\,\alpha^{(0)}_{kk}\,U_{i,mk}+\alpha^{(0)*}_{kk}\,\beta^{(1)*}_{mk}\,V_{i,km}\right]$ vanishes to first order and needs the usual care. However, we notice that, contrary to the other cases analysed before, the denominator of the whole expression reads

$$\sum_{k,m\in C} k\,\Re\left[\alpha^{(1)*}_{km}\,\alpha^{(0)}_{kk}\,U_{i,mk}+\alpha^{(0)*}_{kk}\,\beta^{(1)*}_{mk}\,V_{i,km}\right]= (k+k')\,\Re\left[\alpha^{(0)}_{k'k'}\,\beta^{(1)}_{kk'}\,e^{-i\,\theta}\right]\,\sinh(2\,r), \quad \text{(D2)}$$

which does not vanish to first order and has been obtained by employing the fourth identity in (A7). This implies that the efficiency will have an expression of the form ii). Explicitly, we find

$$\eta = 1+\frac{1}{(k+k')}\,\frac{2}{\sinh(2\,r)}\,\frac{\dot{\mathcal{Z}}_E(0)-\mathcal{G}_S(r)}{R_S}\,h - \frac{1}{(k+k')}\,\frac{1}{\sinh(2\,r)}\,\frac{\xi_L(T)}{2}\,\frac{\mathcal{Z}_S(0)+\mathcal{D}_S(r)}{R_S}\,h, \quad \text{(D3)}$$

where we have introduced the function

$$\mathcal{G}_S(r) := \sinh(2\,r)\left[\sum_{\substack{m\in S\\ n\in E}} n\,\tanh r\,\left(|\alpha^{(1)}_{mn}|^2+|\beta^{(1)}_{mn}|^2\right) + \sum_{m\in E} m\,\Re\left[(\alpha^{(1)}_{km}\,\beta^{(1)}_{k'm}+\alpha^{(1)}_{k'm}\,\beta^{(1)}_{km})e^{-i\,\theta}\right]\right], \quad \text{(D4)}$$

the function

$$\mathcal{D}_S(r) := \sinh(2\,r)\,\Re\left((\alpha^{(0)}_{kk}\,\beta^{(2)}_{k'k}+\alpha^{(0)}_{k'k'}\,\beta^{(2)}_{kk'})\,e^{-i\,\theta}\right) + 2\,\sinh^2 r\,\left(|\alpha^{(1)}_{kk'}|^2+|\beta^{(1)}_{k'k}|^2\right) + \sinh^2 r\sum_{\substack{m\in S\\ k\in C}}\left(|\beta^{(1)}_{km}|^2-|\alpha^{(1)}_{km}|^2\right), \quad \text{(D5)}$$

and the function

$$R_S := \Re\left[\alpha^{(0)}_{k'k'}\,\beta^{(1)}_{kk'}\,e^{-i\,\theta}\right]. \quad \text{(D6)}$$

Notice that, when $r \ll 1$, the denominator of (D3) cannot be expanded in series as we have done before, and we need to take the h^2 terms as dominant ones. This problem with the "largeness" of the leading order term in an expansion series in cavity scenarios has been already discussed in [25].

Furthermore we also see that R_S oscillates periodically as a function of time. Since it vanishes, this requires us to be able to consider the second order terms periodically in time and to address correctly the perturbative procedure [25].

[1] T. D. Ladd, F. Jelezko, R. Laflamme, Y. Nakamura, C. Monroe, and J. L. O'Brien, Nature **464**, 45 (2010).
[2] N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, W. Tittel, and H. Zbinden, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 145 (2002).
[3] L. A. Correa, J. Palao, D. Alonso, and G. Adesso, Scientific Reports **4**, 3949 EP (2014).
[4] J. Goold, M. Huber, A. Riera, L. del Rio, and P. Skrzypczyk, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **49**, 143001 (2016).
[5] P. M. Alsing and I. Fuentes, Classical and Quantum Gravity **29**, 224001 (2012).
[6] D. E. Bruschi, I. Fuentes, and J. Louko, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 061701 (2012).
[7] N. Friis, M. Huber, I. Fuentes, and D. E. Bruschi, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 105003 (2012).
[8] C. Sabín, D. E. Bruschi, M. Ahmadi, and I. Fuentes, New Journal of Physics **16**, 085003 (2014).
[9] J. Lindkvist, C. Sabín, I. Fuentes, A. Dragan, I.-M. Svensson, P. Delsing, and G. Johansson, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 052113 (2014).
[10] G. Adesso, S. Ragy, and A. R. Lee, Open Systems & amp; Information Dynamics **21**, 1440001 (2014).
[11] M. T. Mitchison, M. Huber, J. Prior, M. P. Woods, and M. B. Plenio, "Autonomous quantum thermal machines in atom-cavity systems," (2016), arXiv:1603.02082 [quant-ph].
[12] N. D. Birrell and P. C. W. Davies, *Quantum Field in Curved Space* (Cambridge University Press, 1984).
[13] J. L. Ball, I. Fuentes-Schuller, and F. P. Schuller, Physics Letters A **359**, 550 (2006).
[14] S. W. Hawking, Nature **248**, 30 (1974).
[15] N. Friis, A. R. Lee, and J. Louko, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 064028 (2013).
[16] W. G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. D **14**, 870 (1976).
[17] V. V. Dodonov, Physica Scripta **82**, 038105 (2010).
[18] X.-B. Wang, T. Hiroshima, A. Tomita, and M. Hayashi, Physics Reports **448**, 1 (2007).
[19] L. Mandel and E. Wolf, *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, 1994).
[20] S. Walborn, C. Monken, S. Pádua, and P. S. Ribeiro, Physics Reports **495**, 87 (2010).
[21] B. P. Abbott, R. Abbott, T. D. Abbott, *et al.* (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 061102 (2016).
[22] C. M. Wilson, G. Johansson, A. Pourkabirian, M. Simoen, J. R. Johansson, T. Duty, F. Nori, and P. Delsing, Nature **479**, 376 (2011).
[23] D. E. Bruschi, A. Dragan, A. R. Lee, I. Fuentes, and J. Louko, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 090504 (2013).
[24] R. Gallego, J. Eisert, and H. Wilming, "Thermodynamic work from operational principles," (2015), arXiv:1504.05056 [quant-ph].

[25] D. Šafránek, A. R. Lee, and I. Fuentes, New Journal of Physics **17**, 073016 (2015).
[26] J. Steinhauer, Nat Phys **10**, 864 (2014).
[27] C. Sabín, J. Kohlrus, D. E. Bruschi, and I. Fuentes, EPJ Quantum Technology **3**, 8 (2016).
[28] D. E. Bruschi, C. Sabín, P. Kok, G. Johansson, P. Delsing, and I. Fuentes, Scientific Reports **6**, 18349 EP (2016).
[29] M. Perarnau-Llobet, K. V. Hovhannisyan, M. Huber, P. Skrzypczyk, J. Tura, and A. Acín, Phys. Rev. E **92**, 042147 (2015).
[30] M. O. Scully, M. S. Zubairy, G. S. Agarwal, and H. Walther, Science **299**, 862 (2003).
[31] References on this model are [4, 11]. In particular, [4] is a review and indeed points to a considerable amount of dedicated work in the literature. Furthermore, [11] develops a realistic proposal of how the necessary interaction Hamiltonian can be engineered in atom-cavity systems.
[32] D. E. Bruschi, J. Louko, D. Faccio, and I. Fuentes, New Journal of Physics **15**, 073052 (2013).
[33] B. P. Abbott, L. S. Collaboration, and V. Collaboration, Living Reviews in Relativity **19** (2016).
[34] F. Dalfovo, S. Giorgini, L. P. Pitaevskii, and S. Stringari, Rev. Mod. Phys. **71**, 463 (1999).
[35] M. Ahmadi, D. E. Bruschi, and I. Fuentes, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 065028 (2014).